DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 407 838 FL 024 499

AUTHOR Eyring, Janet Louise
TITLE Is Project Work Worth It?
PUB DATE Apr 97
NOTE 55p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Assignments; Classroom Techniques; Cooperation; Curriculum Design; Empathy; *English (Second Language); *Group Dynamics; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; *Research Projects; Second Language Instruction; Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation; *Student Projects; Time Factors (Learning)

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the utility of project work in university-level English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) instruction. Projects are defined as assignments that incorporate student input, with content deriving from real second language use through extensive contact with either native speakers or native texts, integrating language skills, and extending over several weeks or more. Three distinguishing features of the approach were a negotiated syllabus, extended research of a single topic, and collaborative assessment. One summer ESL course was conducted using project work, and two conventional ESL classes provided comparison groups. Data were gathered through classroom observation, researcher-student interaction, and student surveys. Results suggest that despite extensive class time devoted to student-centered, project-related activities, neither teachers nor students were fully satisfied with the experience. Anticipated group solidarity and empathy were not experienced. Female students were most responsive to the project approach. Problems of focus were observed, somewhat more in the project group than comparison groups. While the project group was more satisfied than comparison groups, goals accomplished were mostly non-academic: e.g., having a lighter workload. Appended materials include notes on methodology, student questionnaires, a course description, and support materials. Contains 49 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 407 838

Is Project Work Worth It?

Abstract

Of the communicative language teaching approaches, project work stands as the most learner-centered. Little research has investigated the effects of project work on students or on a teacher implementing project work for the first time. This case study which includes a comparison group explores these effects in a university ESL setting. Naturalistic research methods such as lesson plans, journals, observations, questionnaires, and interviews reveal greater time expenditure and student influence in three unusual activities of project work: negotiating a syllabus, implementing a long-term project, and collaborative assessing. Benefits for students may outweigh frustrations for the teacher, but more research is needed to confirm such effects and investigate viable modifications of the project work model in various ESL settings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Janet Eyring

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL024499

Is Project Work Worth It?

> Whether we are trying to adjust to altered conditions in our environment or actually trying to alter who we are and how we interact with those around us, change will not be easy. (Kahaney, et al., 1993, p. xiii.)

John Dewey's (1938) and William Kilpatrick's (1918) arguments for using the classroom, and particularly projects, to prepare students for participation in a democratic society have had a great impact on pedagogy in schools in the free world. Perhaps the best illustration of this in recent memory was the "open classroom" of the 1960s where students freely interacted with each other and their teachers on tasks or larger projects without separation of walls. These classrooms condemned traditional "transmission" models of instruction where the learner was considered an empty vessel to be filled. Instead they encouraged learning through the process of inquiry, cooperation, and experience in order to create a responsible and informed citizenry.

As noted by Legutke and Thomas (1991), it was not until the mid-1970s that language teachers realized the rich potential of projects for promoting meaningful interaction and seriously began implementing this approach in the language classroom. What we know about the implementation of these projects has largely been based on the retrospective published accounts of some of these language teachers (See Fried-Booth (1982, 1986), Legutke (1984,1985), Carter and Thomas (1986), Haines (1989), Legutke and Thomas (1991), and Padgett (1994) for examples). In these descriptive reports, the term "project" has been used rather loosely to refer to something as small as a single content-based task like writing a letter to a congressman, writing a poem, or making a cherry pie to a full-scale, multi-layered activity like writing a class newspaper, conducting

and reporting on interviews at an airport, writing and performing a play, and publishing a wheel-chair guide for a city.

This study represents one of the first attempts to systematically research one of these latter types of full-scale projects in an ESL setting. Before moving on to a more detailed discussion of this case study, which included a comparison group, an operational definition of project work will be presented which clearly distinguishes this approach from other well-known approaches.

Project Work: An operational definition

Projects, as defined here, must incorporate some form of student input, their content must derive from the real second-language world either through extensive contact with native speakers or native texts; they must integrate language skills; and they must extend over a fairly long period of time (from several weeks to a full term).

Compared with other second language teaching approaches which supposedly foster second language acquisition through extended input and negotiative interaction, project work shares some features. Some of these are: the inclusion of tasks, emphasis of content over form, individualization of activities, student input in goal setting and evaluation, and groupwork (Figure 1).

Insert Figure 1 about here

However, project work, (at least, the real-world, student-centered variety) can be distinguished from these other language teaching approaches by three activities which vary on two parameters. The three distinguishing activities are a student-negotiated syllabus, extended research of one topic, and

collaborative assessment. First Parameter: these three activities imply more time being spent in the classroom in open negotiation of what is to be learned, how it is to be learned, and how it is to be assessed. Second Parameter: they also imply more student influence in class decision-making processes.

With this operational definition of project work, we now turn to the rationale for studying various aspects of project work. The best reason is that few empirical studies have investigated the effects of projects on teacher and student experience (Legutke and Thomas, 1991). With the increased time and influence that students presumably have in structuring classroom life during "projects," the role the teacher plays in facilitating this restructuring of power and the attitudes of students during this process have largely gone unreported.

Review of the Literature

Although there has been little research of project work, there has been some research in related areas. Studies of cooperative learning in general education, task-based learning in second-language learning, and group processes in management share certain features with project work and therefore may suggest possible student and teacher outcomes.

First, what is known about teacher role in project work instruction? Much of the theoretical or empirical literature about teacher experience during project work, project-like, or cooperative learning activities deals with the changed, more complex role of teachers. In some cases, this change is merely described (Strevens, 1987); in others, it is related to the restructuring of power in the classroom which results from increased peer input and interaction (Breen, 1985; Kramsch, 1985; Willet & Jeannot, 1993). In most cases, the process of change is not viewed neutrally but as a difficult process which involves the

changing of fundamental attitudes about teacher/student relationships and the learning of new skills in management, materials development, methodology, etc. (Abe, Duda and Henner-Stanchina, 1985; Chell, 1985; Cohen, 1986; Fried-Booth, 1986; Prabhu, 1987). This process does not usually occur automatically but must be supported by extended teacher training (Yalden, 1987) unless the teacher perchance intuitively understands the project work setting (Legutke and Thomas, 1991)

Research relating to the possible effect that project work might have on learner attitudes is best documented in the cooperative learning literature which has focused on the use of cooperative learning in mixed native and non-native English speaking classes. Slavin, et al. (1985) reports the results of numerous cooperative learning studies, some of which measure attitudinal effects in cooperative settings.

With regard to general satisfaction, research shows that individuals feel greater motivation (under certain conditions) and self-esteem but less anxiety in cooperative learning groups (Slavin, 1978; Slavin, 1985; Haines and McKeachie, 1967). Students working in mixed ability cooperative learning groups generally feel more altruistic, believe that cooperation is good, and want classmates to succeed (Johnson and Johnson, 1985); working in mixed ethnic groups often enhances positive student attitudes (Johnson, Johnson and Maruyama, 1983). Regarding cooperative learning evaluation procedures, the longer students are evaluated with a cooperative grading system, the more they feel that it is fair (D. Johnson and R. Johnson, 1983; D. Johnson, R. Johnson, Anderson, 1983). Also research has shown that group rewards as well as individual rewards for effort must be given in order to produce the most positive response from students (Slavin, 1983).

With this background, two exploratory research questions were posed at the beginning of the study which attempted to address gaps in the second language learning literature regarding teacher experience with and student attitudes toward project work as compared to regular ESL classroom processes.

1. What experiences does the project work teacher undergo with regard to implementing the following activities for the first time: a) negotiating a syllabus, b) facilitating a long-term project, c) collaborating in assessment?
2. Does project work engender certain positive attitudes (such as self-esteem, motivation, friendliness, etc.) in students while they are a)negotiating a syllabus, b) researching a long-term project, and c)collaborating in assessment? Do these attitudes vary according to such personal factors as gender, proficiency, visa status, or ethnic background?

Method

The qualitative and quantitative methods detailed in this section were originally selected to investigate a broader research agenda described in the author's 1989 dissertation entitled Teacher Experiences and Student Responses in ESL Project Work Instruction: A case study. The design of the original study not only addressed the preceding two research questions but a third question on student proficiency responses which reported the results of a multi-skills achievement test, a learning strategy inventory, a cloze test and a final paper in a project work classroom. Because of the breadth of the original study, this study which proceeded from the original research design necessarily focuses only on a portion of the results relative to teacher experience and student attitudinal response in project work versus regular instruction.

The "project course" for the study was a heterogenous, multi-skills intermediate English 33B course which was taught during Summer Term, 1988 in the ESL Service Courses at Institution X. Two comparison classes offered through Institution X Extension were also concurrently observed in order to obtain comparison data related to classroom processes.[1] The established curriculum of 33B was organized around topical units which reinforced the listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills necessary for students to succeed in an academic setting. Typical activities included reading and listening comprehension exercises, grammar worksheets, class discussions, essay writing, etc. The comparison courses were not exactly equivalent to the project work course, but they were able to provide "normal ESL class" data which could usefully supplement the author's own experience teaching 33B during five previous quarters in both university and university extension settings. This collection of data provided a strong baseline from which to compare project work activities.

Susan and Carol (as they will be known in this article) were the teachers of the test group and the two comparison groups, respectively. Both teachers were about the same age and had had more than two years of teaching experience before the study began, having taught overseas and in the Institution X Service Courses. Each teacher had studied and spoke at least one other language besides English. Both teachers were enrolled as full-time students the quarter before in the Master's Program of the Department of TESL/Applied Linguistics and had taught English 33B as teaching assistants using the standard curriculum. Neither teacher was familiar with the project work approach before the study began.

The author of this study played the role of a resource-observer-participant in Susan's class and resource-observer in Carol's classes. As far as input to the study, the author provided a brief overview of project work (especially the three distinguishing activities) to Susan before the term began, provided a few teaching materials to Susan, made a presentation in Susan's class about projects which her own students had previously done, and substituted for her for a few instructional hours at the end of the course. Because the author was present during every class period (50 hours), her main role was as an observer. Other than providing a few resource materials to Carol, she was also mainly an observer in Carol's class on eleven days or for 22 hours of instruction.

In order to collect data to answer the research questions, the investigator used several naturalistic research methods, which in most cases required the teachers themselves to serve as important collaborators. These methods included observing, interviewing, viewing teaching materials, and administering questionnaires during class time. The reason for using such a variety of methods to investigate each question was to increase the chances of "triangulation" where patterns and regularities could be confirmed by more than one data source. Figures 2 and 3 provide a visual overview of the various methods and means of analysis used.

Insert Figures 2 and 3 about here

To obtain information about teacher experiences while planning, teaching and evaluating project work activities, both teachers were interviewed formally about their planning processes at the beginning of the quarter and were observed and informally interviewed throughout the quarter. A teaching journal

and lesson plans were also collected from Susan in order to keep track of any challenges or difficulties she was encountering while teaching project work throughout the course. Finally, Susan was interviewed on five separate occasions using the stimulated recall method patterned after Conners (1978).[2]

While the previous methods provided insights to Susan's experience planning before and after class, the stimulated recall interviews clarified the challenges and successes she experienced during instruction. To analyze this comprehensive data and the other teacher experience data mentioned, descriptive analyses were used following Dorr-Bremme (personal communication, 1989) and Miles and Huberman (1988).

In order to gather information about student attitudes, students in both classes were observed, informally interviewed, and were administered a standard end-of-quarter questionnaire where students indicated satisfaction with the course and the instructor on a nine-point scale. Three other questionnaires were administered to the project work students to identify their specific likes and dislikes. One questionnaire required students to fill out a Likert-Scale about classroom activities. Another was an open-ended questionnaire about the strengths and weaknesses of the class. The ten most frequently mentioned responses to this questionnaire were then included in another questionnaire where students were asked to rank order the items with regard to which had been most valuable to them.

Again descriptive methods were used to analyze most of the data; however, for the rank order questionnaire, the Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance procedure was run.

Results

Project versus Comparison Class Activities

An analysis of the data shed light on the differing experiences of the project work class and the comparison classes with regard to task types and time spent in planning, research, and assessment activities.

As shown in Figure 5, naturalistic observation revealed a wide array of tasks related to the three unusual project work activities previously identified.

Insert Figure 4 about here

Negotiation of syllabus activities involved generating possible topics for the project, choosing among the alternative topics, organizing fields of research, and scheduling time. Once the project topic of researching and designing a foreign students' guide to Los Angeles was selected, completing the project involved other sorts of "work" activities like: viewing films, interviewing consultants, learning to use the library, and collaborative writing. Collaborative assessment involved such tasks as discussing group evaluation procedures and point allocations on tasks, evaluating oral performance of peers individually and in small groups, and peer editing.

The relative time spent on planning, researching, and assessing in the project work class is shown in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Although an exact comparison between time spent on these activities in the comparison classes is impossible (because the researcher was not present during every hour), it was clear that none of these activities occurred or occurred to the same degree in the comparison classes. In Carol's classes, only 35 minutes was devoted to a presentation of the syllabus (See Appendix A), which was much shorter than the 10.47 hours indicated for project work. Although Carol's students may have spent as much time in research and writing activities as the project work class, it was certain that they did not spend 16.9 hours focusing on one general research topic. Finally, 6.82 hours on collaborative assessment in the project work class was comparatively long considering that almost all of the testing time in Carol's classes was devoted to individual testing procedures rather than collaborative evaluation or peer feedback activities.

Now that it has generally been confirmed that instructional processes varied in length for the two types of classes, a more in-depth analysis of teacher experiences and student responses during planning, researching, and assessing will be presented.

Hypothesis #1: Teacher Experiences

Negotiating a Syllabus. First, referring to the experience of the teacher during negotiated planning, Susan's own planning processes can be discussed. Susan characterized planning for project work as not more work than in a regular class but more "brainwork," although she did complain sometimes about having to prepare activities for 2 to 2-1/2 hour chunks of time for four consecutive days throughout the quarter. She was not able to preplan in the same way as she ordinarily did because she felt that she had to incorporate student requests and preferences in activities. In spite of these challenges, the

lesson plans she made generally reflected what went on in the classroom. (See Appendix B for a copy of the syllabus and Appendix C for the first day's lesson plan, typical of others created for the class.)

The negotiation of the syllabus, as defined in this study, extended throughout the summer quarter. Because of the novelty of this procedure, Susan felt increasingly frustrated with negotiated planning processes as the quarter progressed. At first, the students did not express complaints about an obviously non-traditional course plan. That is, when Susan presented the idea of a project at the beginning of the class, students were not noticeably resistant to the idea of participating in the design of their own course.

Then, when Susan suggested several sample project topics in a handout (Appendix D), again there seemed to be no concern that anything out of the ordinary was happening. In fact, it was only a little later, when students were negotiating activities for a preparatory mini-project that Susan began feeling some doubts about her own role. In her teaching journal she states:

> Well, what I've been realizing is that I have set ways that I want things to be and that--and that I like to impose that structure on my students and I do that in usual--ordinary classes and I'm having to struggle against that and to not care so much that it's my format that they are following but instead that it's something that they all agree on (SR1, 8:386-396).

During the next two and one half weeks, student input was elicited in many activities. For example, students brainstormed a project topic, then narrowed and subcategorized it. They also chose work partners, voted on movies to provide background information on Los Angeles, and collaboratively

wrote a project proposal for what ultimately would be an investigation of recreational opportunities, student life and social problems in Los Angeles. One particularly unusual activity Susan created was a resource inventory (Appendix E) which elicited information about student skills, possessions, and knowledge. Through this and with other activities, the students played an extensive and active part in class decision making processes.

However, as students became ready to pursue research interests independently in sub-groups during the third week of the quarter and some students did not seem as engaged or enthusiastic as she might have expected, Susan began to fear that she was losing control in the classroom. In order to prevent the course from becoming a "free for all," she returned to more focussed ESL instruction related to project topics such as a cloze exercise made from a Los Angeles Times article on downtown entertainment and a listening guide for a movie about the history of Los Angeles.

Subsequent to this, Susan began privately getting complaints, mostly from the more academically motivated students, that they were not getting what they needed from the class and they felt discouraged about lack of participation from lackadaisical peers. When Susan noticed that there were only four students in class during the second hour on a day when students had been excused to do free research only during the first hour, she became very upset and told them that she was not giving students time off ever again. This sparked a public response from one of the most proficient students who had privately complained about student enthusiasm for the Foreign Students' Guide to Los Angeles project. He persuasively addressed his classmates and pleaded with them to think about ways they could improve the class because the lack of motivation was really their problem not the teacher's. This comment

encouraged a few others to discuss why work on the project was not going as well as might have been expected. Susan's journal entry reflected her disappointment with student commitment to the project:

> I was somewhat disturbed by Chen's comment that students were losing motivation because of the project (or whatever he was saying, which was somewhat unclear) but was glad that Michael countered by pointing out that some of the students were just here to have fun and didn't want to spend a lot of time doing outside work for the class. That is a big problem. I always take it personally when my students don't show up for class (and that goes for ordinary ESL classes also--but I think the emphasis on autonomy and my lack of authoritarian teacher behavior in this class may be a factor in the absentee rate as well) (TJ,14:36-41; 15:1-4).

Following this event, Susan taught six regular ESL activities which did not relate to the project content. Because of the mixed reactions she had been receiving with the project work approach, she felt that doing regular ESL activities would raise her "credibility" with the students.

Although certain students surprised her with sparks of initiative until the end of the course, others became less engaged in classroom planning processes. The lukewarm response from the students made Susan feel emotionally drained so that she solicited student input less and less as the course came to an end.

This synopsis has shown that creating a negotiated syllabus is not a straightforward process for the project work teacher or the students. Viewing the course from a purely product perspective, it is clear that the students did succeed in making their own plans regarding what, how, when, and how long

they were to learn. However, the "process" described here demanded a great deal of effort on the part of the teacher and seemed to satisfy her less as the quarter went on.

Facilitating a Long-Term Project. Just as Susan's intercession in the planning was evident, so was her guidance in the project research very obvious. In the case of orchestrating a large project, Susan also had her discouragements. Some were related to the necessity of creating activities, resources, and materials relevant to the creation of the project Guide and the subtopics of student life at Institution X, recreation in LA and social problems in LA; others related to the responses of the students to such attempts. Although negative student feedback was not incremental over time, as it had been during the negotiated planning process, it was intermittent enough to be a source of irritation that Susan had not experienced to the same degree in previous classes.

Susan's roles during these activities presented specific challenges for her. As materials developer, she often found it hard to predict student needs and find time to develop project-related tasks. In her journal she writes:

> I feel like I am somehow supposed to be able to intuit their language needs and provide the optimum amount of instruction and practice so that everything they are doing on the project becomes a wonderful learning experience, but I really don't know what their needs are--apart from the survey I did--and besides I simply don't have the time to be making brand-new exercises and tailoring everything to the project (TJ,14:7-13).

As a resource, Susan felt greater pressure to come up with more resources for students than she would have done in a regular class. Students

received word processing instruction for their Foreign Students' Guide to Los Angeles, model questionnaire books to prepare a survey about student life at Institution X, culture shock articles, Los Angeles tourist guides, and library index instruction.

In organizing and managing activities, Susan very much assumed a facilitative rather than authoritative role. Rather than making decisions herself, she used random decision-making techniques like flipping a coin to decide which group would answer which questions or having students choose a number between one and ten to determine the ordering for the individual oral presentations. She tended to stand back from class activities encouraging students to help each other. She interceded only when necessary. This can be illustrated by a small group session where students were trying to negotiate the type of final presentation format they would use. When one student kept saying "quiz" indicating he felt the group should consider doing a "quiz show," she did not intercede in the discussion until after she saw that group members had misinterpreted the meaning of "quiz" in this context as an "examination" and they were going to lose the idea.

Considering the large amounts of groupwork and discussion involved in project work, certain participation variables affected the overall success of a long-term project for the teacher and thus her enthusiasm and energy for facilitating the project. Although these factors affected the quality and evenness of interaction in the comparison ESL classes as well, they were more evident in the project work class. This will be illustrated in the discussion that follows.

LATE REGISTRATION

Late registration, although not such a problem in a regular ESL course, concerned the project work teacher. Regular students can easily catch up what they miss, especially if they have only missed the first few days of instruction. However, in project work, where the first few days are used to build rapport and community, it is much more disruptive when students arrive late. Susan was especially upset when two students who were friends arrived on the third day of the class and did not seem to like any of the project topics or the manner in which the discussion was progressing. Susan commented that "They seemed to be pretty chummy with each other and not really with the program" (SR1,6:323-326). In the end, they dropped the course.

This scenario, however, did not occur without exception. Some students were able to catch on to the rhythm of the class and integrate quite normally. This was the case for another student who enrolled late but was able to adjust quite quickly. Her first journal entry reads:

> I just have been in the class for two days, so I can't say many things, although I can try to describe my first impression which has been great. First of coming here, I thought it would be much more theoric that it is, in fact. I mean that, as I was used to learn English insisting on grammar and on rules. I didn't think we were going to spend our class on talking and discussing. In my opinion, I think it is much more interesting. We should make good use of the oportunity that we have (sic)...(Journal, 6/7, Maria)

EXCESSIVE ABSENCE AND/OR TARDINESS

Tardiness and absence, which also occur in regular ESL classes, are more disruptive to the project work class because they not only affect the "offender" but also the "offender's" group. Within the first days of project work, one student found himself working alone because his two partners were just not showing up. When the student complained about them, Susan used her non-directive style and said "I don't know what you want to do about that" (OBS4,18:939-940) rather than saying she would try to contact the student. Another student suggested that the absentee could be reached through a note at her dorm, but the students never followed through on this to see if they could locate her. (Susan also never tried to locate the student.) In the meantime, the student working alone felt more and more depressed not having anyone to coordinate with so that when his two group members finally did return, Susan did intercede and asked that group members be responsible for getting other group members there because she did not want to chase after them.

Later on in the course, several members of one group were persistently late. This was very upsetting to the teacher because two of them were quite good students and she had never had an attendance problem before. She began associating the problem with the structuring of power in project work:

> I am really worried about the attendance problem these days. I don't know if we can expect to see Francois or Yvette again, Sonia drops in when she feels like it, and Machiko can't seem to get herself out of bed (though she seems to be involved in the class and working hard.) Is it the project--do they see it as a chance to goof off, or are they not

> interested? My hunch is that it's the former--maybe they don't feel that they need to come to class every day in order to do their part of the project. I have never had an attendance problem before, so I don't know where it comes from (TJ,17:1-8).

EXCESSIVE QUIETNESS

A common problem with groupwork is that some students talk much more than others. Thus, Susan explicitly discussed the importance of "checkers" and "encouragers" becoming more active in group discussion and reminded students of this on more than one occasion. When she saw someone who had not participated in a discussion, she also asked for his/her opinion. With some students this approach seemed to work because they began participating more actively as the quarter wore on. However, in this class there was one student who persistently kept quiet, even when expressing an opinion would have been greatly appreciated by other group members. When students struggled but finally succeeded in coming up with an idea for a final presentation, Susan noted one group member's (i.e., Mario's) minimal response:

> Mario had been just kind of sitting there and finally Edward said, "What do you think of it?" and as Edward wrote in his evaluation essay, "I'm not only the monitor, I'm the secretary, the encourager, and the checker too"...because he's trying to get everyone to agree and stuff and so I was glad that he did and I was hoping that Mario would come up with something more than "yeah" (SR4,35:1896-1911).

EXTREMELY LOW AND HIGH PROFICIENCY STUDENTS

The effect that one quiet student can have in a group is great; however, extremely low and high proficiency students can also affect group dynamics. Low proficiency students can bog down discussions by asking for definitions of words that everyone else knows or by just not comprehending the flow of conversation. This happened in one group so much that the teacher started coming to the aid of the student who was always shouldering the burden of explanation to the low proficiency student (SR4,16:835-845).

Low proficiency students can also be ignored by other students which can be a very frustrating situation for a teacher who is supposedly trying to promote democratization of learning. Susan felt "frustrated" when a low proficiency student was paired with a higher proficiency student to do peer editing of oral presentation outlines and the higher proficiency student did not listen to any of the other's suggestions (SR4,15:775-799).

Although Susan complimented the most proficient students in the class numerous times for their good leadership skills and patience with other students, she also saw their negative tendency to domineer at other times. She noted a good example of this when two monitors were working together, and the one made the other feel dejected because he would not let him express his opinion fully (SR4,33:1775-1782).

When Susan gave her reasons for changing back into a more traditional teaching mode near the end of the course, it was the high proficiency, academically-oriented students that caused her to do so. She felt that

groupwork activities were not giving these students what they needed. In an interview, she commented on one of these students:

> He's been talking the whole quarter about how he really needs to learn to make presentations and to write and to organize and I was thinking, "Has he gotten that from this class?" And I was thinking about this also--last night with his journal--just--am I failing this student's--because he really wants something more--more academic, more structured somehow--I don't know--I mean, he seems to be so--he seems to be very enthusiastic, but I wonder if I'm not--if there isn't more I could be doing for him personally (SR5,16:851-865)

LACK OF COOPERATION

The main complaint Susan voiced about lack of cooperation among students was that they depended too much on her or themselves rather than on each other. This might be understandable at the beginning when students were learning to become adjusted to one another and to become less dependent on the teacher; however, certain students persisted in working alone to the end of the course. One student excused himself for being late every morning by saying that his group didn't need him (SR4,20:1057-1062). Another, who was placed in a new group because his original group dropped the course, claimed at the end "I don't have a group" (SR4,37:1993-1995).

When students were engaged in research on their topics, Susan was astounded that they were not able to see each other as resources for any one of the sub-topics they had chosen. Yet when she suggested that students send around a questionnaire to each of the group members or get input on their

questionnaires, students did not do it (SR3,31:1699-105). Instead students remained dependent upon her:

> They're not getting the information--they're just wondering what I think, what's my own experience and is that and that's not--one person's experience is interesting, but it's more interesting to have a lot of people's experiences, so I'm hoping that--that they'll...see that somehow (SR3,31:1683-1691).

LACK OF INITIATIVE

Susan commented on lack of initiative (or laziness) several times during the quarter. She labelled one student a "dud" who never showed up on time and consistently talked off topic during group activities. One student who was in this lackadaisical student's group wrote in her Weekly Review, "I'm getting fed up with this class." When the teacher asked her why, she said that this same student and another student in her group were not doing any work. Susan was bothered that this student's enthusiasm might be dampened through no direct fault of her own.

Fortunately, these negative participation factors were also balanced with success stories. Susan felt that two reluctant female students especially benefitted from project work activities. One had complained about not having any friends at the beginning of the class and had failed English 33B the quarter before. The other often wore a blank stare on her face. By the end, both of these students opened up and initiated interaction more than any of the other class members.

Susan also commented on the exceptional oral skills students exhibited during their individual oral reports near the end of the course. Their presentations seemed richer in content and more fluent than usual. Finally, Susan commented on the progress students made on group oral negotiation skills. She was especially impressed with one problematic group's ability to develop in this area.

Collaborating in Assessment. Turning now to assessment, various types of assessment were used. Susan gave feedback to students individually but students also assessed themselves, another peer or a group of classmates through checklists, objective questionnaires, journal essays and weekly reviews such as the one contained in Appendix F, adapted from Fried-Booth (1986). These latter forms of assessment were not present in the comparison classes to the same degree as they had been in the project course according to observation and teacher interviews.

Five important elements distinguished Susan's and Carol's assessment experiences. These can all be related to the redistribution of power which occurred in the project work class.

First, group tasks as well as individual tasks were evaluated. Table 2 shows the equal distribution of points for group and individual tasks for the project. In contrast, this was not an important part of evaluation in the control classes which incorporated only one group participation grade.

Insert Table 2 about here

Second, students were involved in evaluating themselves. In fact, Susan engineered the grading of tasks so that all of the tasks in the course which

received scores (excluding the final exam) were dependent on peer input or peer evaluation. On the other hand, peer evaluation was only observed one time in the comparison classes.

Third, feedback on fluency as well as accuracy was more of an evaluation concern in the project work class than in the comparison classes because of the more open-ended nature of project work research. In her journal, Susan noted that she promoted fluency during classtime by not correcting all errors or in directing other students to correct them:

> I still do not know how to monitor the language that goes on in the classroom. When Edward was introducing people he said that Lina was from "French" and she got all anxious about whether it was OK to correct him. I wanted her to--better that that kind of correction comes from the students than that I keep interrupting to make corrections. I don't know what the best way to encourage that sort of thing is--and I don't know where to draw the line between letting everything go and correcting everything. (Ordinarily that isn't as much of a problem, since there's a lot more explicit controlled language practice) (TJ,7:23-32).

A fourth difference in grading criteria was that Susan exhibited more subjectivity in grading. One example of this occurred in the final interviews when both teachers were asked to characterize a "passing" versus a "failing" student. Carol indicated that in a regular class a student who passes is one who can accumulate as many points as he needs to get a passing grade. Susan, on the other hand, rated a project work student as successful if he was "enthusiastic, motivated, tried to get the group together, and made suggestions."

Finally, a fifth difference in assessment relates to flexibility. Susan, unlike Carol, showed her flexibility in grading by adjusting grade percentages at the end of the course based on informed student input, distributing preliminary grade sheets which could be updated and improved if students were so motivated, and inviting poor attenders to come to her office to "work out" their grades.

It is clear from this discussion that assessment takes many forms, and in this project work class, these forms were quite varied. Peers provided increased input and feedback in learning tasks and Susan integrated more subjective, flexible grading in the evaluation process than she would have done in a regular class. The assignment of grades was different but was no more difficult than it had been in a regular class. However, Susan's worry about how and when to correct during classwork was more evident.

Hypothesis #2: Student Attitudes

Now we summarize student attitudes of the comparison group versus the project work group classes. When interviewed, students in the comparison groups were unanimous in their opinion that the ESL course taught by Carol was not an ordinary course. Certain dissatisfactions were expressed because students were unfamiliar with topic-based units used to integrate the practice of language skills. Students, in general liked the writing emphasis of the course, but they felt that more focussed grammar instruction was needed. (A few students would have liked more opportunities for speaking practice.) Regarding evaluation, all of the students felt that the teacher had graded them fairly (but perhaps a little high); however, a few students mentioned that teacher feedback had been too limited.

Some reservations about and positive aspects of project work were also expressed. Table 3 shows that project work students ranged from feeling above average (as indicated by 3.5) to above high (4.60) satisfaction with various aspects of the course. Of particular interest here is the mean rating of 4.20 indicating high overall satisfaction with the course and the small standard deviation of .42 indicating ratings were closely clustered around this mean. Students also especially enjoyed selecting their own project topic. Evaluation procedures (such as the process types that Susan used) were also rated high. The last six questionnaire items reported in Table 3 coincidentally refer to students' experiences working and communicating for long periods of time in small groups.

Insert Table 3 about here

We can induce from these results that students generally enjoyed working with each other in groups (although the high standard deviations for "working with others" and "efficiency of groupwork" suggest a lack of consensus about the effectiveness of groupwork). Through interaction and peer feedback, they were also able to practice some functional language structures during discussion and develop general language skills structures while collaboratively working with others on learning tasks. Somewhat less satisfaction was experienced with the quality and quantity of ideas discussed in small groups and with the group's ability to efficiently organize itself for work.

Next, the rank ordering that students assigned to each of the items in the rank order questionnaire was significant, which means there was a strong significant agreement among students on the relative value of each aspect in the course. Table 4 shows that students most valued their teacher and their

opportunities for listening and speaking to other class members. They also valued learning to write essays, papers, and the Guide to Los Angeles for Foreign Students. The fourth place position went to "grammar lessons," but "making friends with classmates" was rated lower. The last place position was rather surprising, as it went to one of the distinguishing activities of project work, "investigating a real topic for a long time."

Insert Table 4 about here

Finally, the students' high satisfaction with the project work course was corroborated by the results of the end-of-the-quarter questionnaire. The overall instructor and overall course ratings for the project work group were higher than the ratings for the comparison group (8.1 and 6.9 on a 9-point scale). This again suggests the possible greater satisfaction students had with the teacher and the instructional process.

Discussion

The results of this study coincide with Legutke and Thomas' (1991) observation about the interdependence of teacher and students in creating autonomous learners in the experiential classroom.

> The degree to which participants share the guiding of the learning process depends on how far their ability to participate has developed, their degree of independence, their willingness to take risks, and of course also on the ability and the willingness of the teacher to allow a part of her own responsibility to pass to the learners (p. 18)

In this project work classroom, learners were given opportunities to participate and be independent as evidenced by the large amount of time (69%

of classtime) devoted to student-centered instruction (negotiated planning, extensive research of student selected topic, and collaborative assessment), yet neither the teacher nor the students was fully satisfied with the achieved results.

First, Susan's challenging experience confirms some previous accounts (Abe, Duda and Henner-Stanchina, 1985; Cohen, 1986) which describe the difficulty of assuming the project work teacher role. Despite her careful introduction of the approach to students, Susan found the concept of autonomy was elusive to students, especially while negotiating the syllabus. Susan also felt discouraged by student discomfort with non-traditional planning processes and their misuse of independence to evade learning opportunities. Additionally, she felt stressed in her role as materials developer, resource, organizer, and manager, while creating original informative materials and motivating less enthusiastic learners in classroom groups. Including learners as coevaluators also required better organization on her part.

As for students' attitudinal responses towards project work, research would have predicted that students engaged in groupwork would have experienced more positive intergroup and social relations than students engaged in more whole-class learning.

It is interesting that students rated working in groups with classmates as the second highest on the rank order questionnaire but only gave it a high average rating on the Likert-scale questionnaire. Observational and interview data revealed few expressions of group solidarity and empathy as Slavin (1985) might have predicted. Rather than encouraging friendships, there seemed to be intergroup friction between the regular full-time academically-oriented students

(who were mostly Asian) and the summer-only vacation-oriented students (who were mostly non-Asian).

Although Webb (1985) found that females were less likely to respond to cooperative learning (especially when they are outnumbered by males, as they were in this study), the two females in the project work class were probably more responsive to the approach than anyone else. Although the number of subjects in this case study was too small to derive any definitive conclusions about the relationship of gender, proficiency, visa status, ethnic background, etc. to attitudes, many of the attitudinal effects observed in other studies of cooperative learning were not found here.

Instead, the results of interviews and observations very much confirmed Prabhu's (1987) experiences with task-based learning in India which showed a "lack of shared expectations between teachers and learners" (p. 22) and somewhat confirmed Alcorso and Kalantsis' experience (1985) with adult immigrants in Australia (cited in Nunan, 1989b) which showed student preference for traditional over communicative activities in the classroom. Considering the three distinguishing activities of project work (negotiating a curriculum, working on an extended project, and collaboratively assessing), students in this project work class consistently maintained that they were generally satisfied with the course (as indicated by their final evaluations) but would have liked to have seen the incorporation of more traditional features such as grammatical instruction, more teacher feedback and correction on written work, and more teacher input in learning. Students also fluctuated greatly in their enthusiasm to participate in project work activities from day to day as indicated by cases of sporadic attendance and lack of readiness for work.

(Some of these same concerns were observed in the comparison group classes, but to a lesser degree.)

It is interesting that the attitudinal results in this study, especially related to the project work class, seem somewhat contradictory to other study results obtained in the literature. At first, it seems paradoxical that students should feel "satisfied" with an approach that they did not fully like. One explanation for this might be that they felt very positively about the restructuring of power in the classroom. After all, students rated the supportive, friendly stance of the teacher as the most valuable aspect of the course and they felt positively about their increased voice in decision-making (planning, learning, and evaluating). In the end, the course may not have been "good," but it was "theirs" and that is why they felt more satisfied than the comparison group did. (Similar reactions might be voiced by citizens in a democracy who defend their right to vote yet fail to cast a ballot, election after election.)

Another explanation for this confusing phenomenon is more practical. For those full-time students who were taking 33B to receive required credit, any kind of a procedure which could streamline the process might look appealing. This was most graphically illustrated in an interview with a full-time engineering student who in the final evaluation interviews admitted (to the researcher but not to the teacher) that he had liked the project work course because it had been so "light" (UFIN,15:825). Other "summer only" students (who constituted almost half the class) confidentially revealed in final interviews that project work had not been very demanding. In doing so, they implied that this had allowed them more time to sightsee, another practical reason for liking project work.

This latter explanation for student satisfaction causes one to wonder about the consequences of the teacher giving the power away. In this class, many students chose to misuse the privilege of choice by participating in a form of "collusion." They had "a hidden agenda" (Nunan, 1989) as they played along with aspects of project work which were self-gratifying (like selecting project topics and taking no unit tests) but avoided or resisted those aspects which demanded cooperation, self-initiative, and hard work. In the meantime, the teacher was generally incognizant of student neglectfulness because students would not admit it (except for the one student mentioned previously) and because she had less direct control over the open-ended activities of project work.

Conclusion

Considering the above "collusion," was project work a viable alternative for ESL teaching at the university in this study? If the results of this study are any guide, the answer is probably no. The project work students felt greater satisfaction with this approach than the comparison group students, but the goals they accomplished were mostly non-academic goals such as having more time for sightseeing or having a lighter work load.

For the teacher, project work in its purest sense, presented challenges not usually encountered in regular ESL teaching. Planning was more unpredictable, developing materials was more demanding, managing students was more frustrating, fears of correcting too much were more frequent, and maintaining credibility was more difficult.

Perhaps, a scaled-down project which took less than 69% of classtime and which incorporated some traditional ESL activities would have allowed a

more gradual and less stressful introduction to the most learner-centered of the communicative approaches for the teacher and the students.

More studies need to document student attitudes and the teacher's perspective while implementing various projects so that more will be known about ideal implementation conditions. Future studies should incorporate a formal teacher training component which better prepares teachers for the successes and pitfalls of student-centered projects. These studies should also include a more formal learner training component where students learn what it means to direct one's own learning process and be an accountable member of a group. Perhaps, current work on learning strategy training (Oxford, 1990; Wenden & Rubin, 1987) could provide some insight in this area. The changes in skills and expectations of teachers and students during project work may not be easy to adopt, but they must occur in order to create the effective democratic language classroom of the 90s.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to the summer school students at Institution X who participated in this study. I am also grateful for the constructive feedback I received from "Susan" and "Carol" on later drafts of this article.

References

Abe, D., Duda, R., & Henner-Stanchina, C. A specialist? What specialist? (1985). In P. Riley (Ed.), Discourse and learning. London: Longman.

Alcorso, C. and M. Kalantsis. (1985). The learning process and being a learner. In the AMEP report to the Committee of Review of the Adult Migrant Education Program. Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Canberra.

Breen, M.P. (1985). The social context for language learning--a neglected situation? Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7, 135-158.

Brinton, D., Snow, A., and Wesche, M. (1988). Content-based second language instruction. New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Carter, B., and H. Thomas. (1986). "Dear Brown Eyes": Experiential Learning in a Project-Oriented Approach. English Language Teaching Journal, 40, 196-204.

Chell, E. (1985). Participation and organization. London: Macmillan.

Cohen, E. (1986). Designing groupwork: strategies for the heterogeneous classroom. New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Conners, R.D. (1978). An analysis of teacher thought processes, beliefs, and principles during instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

Dewey, John. (1938). Experience and Education. New York: MacMillan.

Dickinson, L. (1987). Self-instruction in language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eyring, J. (1991). Experiential language learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, Teaching English as a second or foreign language, second edition. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Eyring, J. (1989). Teacher experiences and student responses in ESL project work instruction: a case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Freeman, Y. and D. Freeman. (1992). Whole language for second language learners. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fried-Booth, D. (1986). Project Work. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fried-Booth, D. (1982). Project Work with Advanced Classes. ELT Journal. Vol. 36, No. 2, January, 98-103.

Goodman, K. (1986). What's whole in whole language? Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Haines, D.B. & McKeachie, W.J. (1967). Cooperation versus competitive discussion methods in teaching introductory psychology. Journal of Educational Psychology, 58, 386-90.

Haines, S. (1989). Projects for the EFL Classroom. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Holden, S. (Ed.) (1977). English for specific purposes. Mansfield: Modern English Publications Limited.

Holec, H. (1979). Autonomy and foreign language learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1983). Social interdependence and perceived academic and personal support in the classroom. Journal of Social Psychology, 120, 77-82.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1985). The internal dynamics of cooperative learning groups. In R. Slavin, et al. (Eds.) Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn. New York: Plenum Press.

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Anderson, D. (1983). Social interdependence and classroom climate. Journal of Psychology, 114, 135-42.

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Maruyama, G. (1983). Interdependence and interpersonal attraction among heterogeneous and homogeneous individuals: a theoretical formulation and a meta-analysis of the research. Review of Educational Research, 53, 5-54.

Kagan, S. (1992). Cooperative Learning. San Juan Capistrano California: Kagan Cooperative Learning.

Kahaney, P., Perry, L, and Janangelo, J. (1993). Theoretical and critical perspectives on teacher change. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Kilpatrick, W.H. (1918). The project method: the use of the purposeful act in the educative process. New York City: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Kramsch, C. (1985). Classroom Interaction and Discourse Options. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, Vol. 7, 169-183.

Legutke, M. Project Airport. (1984,1985). Part I. Modern English Teacher, Vol. 4, April, 10-14. Part II. Modern English Teacher, Vol. 12, January, 28-31.

Legutke, M. and H. Thomas. (1991). Process and experience in the language classroom. Harlow: Longman Group UK Limited.

Long, M. A role for instruction in second language acquisition: task-based language teaching. (1985). In K. Hyltenstam & Pienemann (Eds.), Modelling and assessing second language acquisition. San Diego: College-Hill Press.

Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: a sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Pub.

Nunan, D. (1989a). Designing tasks for the communicative classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. Hidden agendas: the role of the learner in programme implementation. (1989b). In K. Johnson, ed. The second language curriculum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. (1990). Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know. New York: Newbury House Pub.

Padgett, G. (1994). An experiential approach: field trips, book publication, video production. TESOL Journal, Spring, 8-11.

Prabhu, N.S. (1987). Second Language Pedagogy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sheerin, S. (1991). Self-access. Language Teaching, July, 143-157.

Slavin, R. (1985). An introduction to cooperative learning research. In R. Slavin, et al. (Eds.), Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn. New York and London: Plenum Press.

Slavin, R. (1978). Student teams and achievement divisions. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12, 39-49.

Slavin, R. (1983). When does cooperative learning increase student achievement? Psychological Bulletin, 94, 429-45.

Slavin, R. et al., Eds. (1985). Learning to Cooperate, Cooperating to Learn. New York and London: Plenum Press.

Strevens, P. (1987). Interaction outside the classroom. In W. Rivers (Ed.), Interactive language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1981). Bilingual education in Ontario: a decade of research. Toronto: Ministry of Education.

Terrell, T. (1977). A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning. Modern Language Journal, 7, 325-36.

Webb, N. (1985). Student interaction and learning in small groups: a research summary. In R. Slavin et al. (Eds.), Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Pub.

Wenden, A. and J. Rubin. (1987). Learner strategies in language learning.. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Willett, J. and M. Jeannot. (1993). Resistance to taking a critical stance. TESOL Quarterly, 27, 3, Autumn.

Yalden, J. (1987). Principles of course design for language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Endnotes

[1] At first glance, one might suspect that the extension courses were quite different from the university course. However, they actually were quite similar. First, because registration was handled by Summer Sessions instead of the regular administration, many students who were admitted in the project work class were not regular full-time university students, which coincidentally was also the case in the university extension courses. Second, in spite of the different times and days spent in the classroom, both classes received 50 hours of instruction. (The project work course met two to two and one half hours, four times a week and the comparison courses met two and one half hours two times a week.) Third, both groups contained a mix of Asian and non-Asian students. Fourth, the project work class and the two comparison classes had similar starting proficiency levels (as determined by a pre-course cloze test which indicated no significant differences among the groups: PW $\bar{x}=15$, C1 $\bar{x}=13.1$, C2 $\bar{x}=13$, $F=2.17$, df 2, 40, $p< .127$).

[2] The stimulated recall method has not been used extensively in second language classroom research; therefore, a short explanation is necessary. Specifically, immediately following a class session where Susan had been videotaped, the author selected about 30 minutes of tape to replay for her. While she viewed the tape, she was asked to comment on anything significant (positive or negative) that she saw happening. Once she made a comment, she was encouraged to describe whether the event was significantly different from regular ESL processes.

Figure 1. A Comparison of Project Work
With Other Second Language Learning Approaches
Which Incorporate Extended Input and/or Negotiated Interaction

Features of Project Work	Other Approaches
Tasks	Task-based learning (Long, 1985; Nunan, 1989a)
Emphasis of content over form	Natural Approach (Terrell, 1977) Immersion education (Swain and Lapkin, 1981) Content-based language learning (Brinton, Snow & Wesche, 1989) Whole Language (Goodman, 1986; Freeman and Freeman, 1992)
Individualization of activities	English for Specific Purposes (Holden, 1977) Study Circles (Holec, 1979) Self-access (Sheerin, 1991)
Student-input in goal setting and evaluation	Contract Learning (Dickinson, 1987)
Groupwork	Cooperative Learning (Kagan, 1992)

Figure 2. Data Sources and Means of Analysis for Describing Teacher Experiences While Planning, Teaching, and Evaluating Project Work Activities

Subjects	Method	Analysis
PW & Comparison Group Teachers	Formal Interviews	Description
PW Teacher	Teaching Journal	Description
PW Teacher	Lesson Plans	Description
PW Teacher	Stimulated Recall[2]	Description
PW & Comparison Group Teachers	Ethnography/Informal Interviews/Materials Collection	Description

Figure 3. Data Sources and Means of Analysis for Describing Student Attitudes Towards Project Work Activities

Subjects	Method	Analysis
Ss in PW class & 2 comparison-group classes	Ethnography & Informal Interviews	Description
Ss in PW class & match-comparison-group ss	Formal interviews	Description
Ss in PW class & 2 comparison-group classes	Standard End-of-quarter Questionnaire	Description
Ss in PW class	Likert-scale Questionnaire	Description
Ss in PW class	Open-ended Questionnaire	Description
Ss in PW class	Rank Order Questionnaire	Kendall's Coef-ficient of Concordance

Figure 4. Types of Project Work Tasks
Observed During Classtime

Student-negotiated Syllabus	Extended Research of One Topic	Collaborative Assessment
* generating project topics	* viewing films	* discussing group evaluation procedures
* choosing among alternative topics	* interviewing consultants	* discussing point allocations on tasks
* organizing fields of research	* learning to use the library	* evaluating oral performance of peers individually
* scheduling time	* collaborative writing	* evaluation oral performance of peers in small groups
		* peer editing

Table 1. Duration of Project Activities

Activity Type	Hours	Percent of Total Time
"Project Work"		
Extended Project	16.90	34%
Negotiation of Syllabus	10.47	21%
Collaborative Assessment	6.82	14%
"Other"		
Miscellaneous Business	6.46	13%
Regular ESL	5.05	10%
Individual Testing	4.30	8%
TOTAL =	50.0	100%

Table 2. Work Evaluated and Weighting of Group and Individual Tasks in the Project Work Class

	Type of Work Evaluated	Points
Class Tasks		
Group Presentation to Real Audience	Oral	10
The Guide to Los Angeles	Written	10
Sub-Group Tasks		
Proposal	Written	10
Group Observation	Oral	5
Group Presentation to Peers	Oral	15
	TOTAL	= 50
Individual Tasks		
Evaluation Essays (3)	Written	15
Oral Presentation	Oral	10
Final Paper	Written	25
	TOTAL	= 50

Table 3. Results of Evaluation Questionnaire for Project Work Course (n=10)

Rating Key:

1 = very low satisfaction
2 = low satisfaction
3 = average satisfaction
4 = high satisfaction
5 = very high satisfaction

ASPECTS OF THE COURSE	$\bar{x}$	(s)
Selection of Own Topics	4.60	.52
General Satisfaction	4.20	.42
One Project Emphasis	3.90	.57
Evaluation Procedures	3.90	.74
Working with Others	3.90	1.20
Functional Language Development	3.70	.48
General Language Development	3.60	.52
Quality of Ideas during Groupwork	3.60	.52
Quantity of Ideas during Groupwork	3.50	.53
Efficiency of Groupwork	3.50	1.18
TOTAL SCORE (50)	38.40	3.17

Table 4. Results of Rank Order Questionnaire with Student-selected Project Work Variables

Variable	Mean Rank (1=most valuable) (10=least valuable)
Supportive, friendly teacher	2.67
Listening & speaking with classmates in small groups	3.67
Writing essays, papers, and The Guide	4.56
Having short grammar lessons based on student needs	5.00
Having a variety of lesson materials, e.g., no textbooks, films, and real people	5.22
Doing videotaped oral presentations and interviews	5.89
Writing journals and weekly reviews	6.67
Making friends with classmates	6.89
Having short reading lessons based on student needs	7.11
Investigating a real topic for a long time	7.33

Kendall's Coeff.	x^2	d.f.	p
.2657*	21.6060	9	.0102

Appendix A

Intermediate English as a Second Language
ENGLISH XL33B - Summer 1988

Instructor: Carol
Telephone:
Mailbox: 3309 Rolfe (8 a.m. - 5 p.m.)

Time: 6:30-9:00 p.m.
Room: Rolfe 2112

Textbooks:

1. Azar, B. Understanding and Using English Grammar.
2. Longman. Dictionary of American English.
   (Or any English-English dictionary.)

Other Materials:

3. $6 photocopying fee
4. 10" X 12" three-ring notebook
5. 5 notebook pocket dividers labeled as follows: Unit 1, Unit 2, Unit 3, Reference Material, Graded Assignments
6. 3-hole punch, 8½" X 11" lined paper with side margins
7. 3 highlighter pens: yellow, blue, pink
   (Bring to each class period.)
8. 3 standard-size manilla folders

Optional Materials:

9. 3-hole punch
10. Stapler and staples

Course Objectives:

This course is designed to help you improve your ability to read, write, and comprehend academic English. In addition, you will do some work on vocabulary and grammar. The focus of the course is on developing the skills you will need in taking other university courses.

Course Description:

The course is divided into three units. Each unit consists of one theme and one rhetorical mode. Each of the three units lasts 3 weeks.

Week	Unit	Rhetorical Mode	Theme
1	0	Intro. & Review	
2-4	1	Definition	Culture
5-7	2	Comparison/Contrast	Love & Family
8-10	3	Cause/Effect	Ethnic Groups

For each unit you will have a combination of readings, listening assignments, and videos on the Unit's theme. You will practice your writing, reading, listening, speaking, vocabulary, and grammar skills. At the end of each unit, you will produce a 5 paragraph essay. The final draft of the essay must be typed unless you have made previous arrangements with the instructor.

Grading:

The course activities will be weighted as follows:

3 essays	30%
Homework, Quizzes, Class Activities	30%
Midterm Exam	10%
Final Exam	20%
Attendance	10%
	100%

All assignments must be turned in on time in order to receive full credit, unless arrangements are made with the instructor in advance. Late homework or essays will receive a grade reduced in points by 10%. Assignments which are more than one week late will not be accepted.

Attendance:

You are required to attend every class and to arrive on time. Attendance will be taken at the beginning of each class period. If you must miss a class, let the instructor in advance.

Final Exam:

The final exam will be given on the last day of class.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

English 33B
Summer 1988
Rolfe 2118
MW 8-9:50, TTH 8-10:20

Instructor: Susan
Office: Rolfe 3326
Tel: 825-7188
Office Hours: MW 10-11
and by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Course Objectives

The purpose of ESL 33B is to help you improve your ability to read and write academic English so that you can succeed in your other courses. In addition to reading and writing, we will pay attention to speaking, listening, and some grammar.

Unlike most ESL courses, this course will not be taught through traditional means such as textbooks, grammar exercises, and regular graded homework. Instead, you will be practicing English skills by working with your classmates on a class project which you as a class will decide on, organize, and carry out. All reading, writing, listening, speaking, and grammar work that we do will come from and feed into the project itself. In this way you will learn the skills you need by using English in real-life situations and by studying a topic which you have chosen and thus should find interesting. You may find that learning English this way is more challenging than other courses you have had, but I hope that you will find it also more enjoyable, and more worthwhile.

Course Requirements

Class Project. As a group and with my help, you will decide on a project which will direct the major work of the course. The project will involve six basic steps:

1. Deciding on a topic.
2. Planning the project.
3. Research/data collection.
4. Preparing the presentation.
5. Making the presentation.
6. Evaluating the presentation.

We will talk about each of these steps in detail as we come to them. The end result of the project will be a presentation to an appropriate audience, along with some kind of documentation, which may consist of a paper, videotape, or other media document. The presentation will be made during Week 6 and all supporting documentation will be due at the time of the presentation.

Final Paper. You will be required to write a 5 to 10 page paper describing either your individual contribution to the class project or your reaction to the process of language learning through project work. This paper will be due on the last day of class.

Journal. You are required to keep a journal documenting the progress of the class project. You may write your journal entries in a small spiral notebook, or you may use a word processor if you prefer. You should write in your journal at least twice a week. I will collect the journals every Monday and give them back to you on Tuesday.

Homework. Assignments will be based on the project and focus on specific skills necessary to complete the project. There will be some smaller writing assignments, and periodically you will be evaluating your own work and that of your classmates as homework.

Textbooks

There are no required textbooks for this course, as the nature of the project we decide will determine the kind of reading and other materials we will use. Because there will probably be a lot of photocopied materials, there is a $5.00 photocopy fee which is due by Tuesday, June 28. If we do not use all the money it will be refunded to you at the end of the summer session.

For those who would like additional grammar practice the following book is recommended: *English Grammar in Use*, by Raymond Murphy. I also recommend that you purchase a good English dictionary such as the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Both of these books are available in the UCLA student store.

Attendance

Full participation by every class member is essential for the success of this class. You should therefore try to attend every class and arrive ON TIME. Please tell me or your group monitor if you will be absent from class. YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE for finding out about any assignment you miss.

Language Laboratory

The Language Laboratory in Powell 190 is available for any students who would like additional listening practice. Please see me if you would like suggestions for improving your listening.

Grading

The following is a tentative breakdown of the grading system for the course. The class project will count for 50% of your final grade, of which 30% will be based on the work of the whole class and 20% will be based on your individual final paper. The rest of your grade will be determined by your participation in class activities, your homework, and the final exam. The exact percentages may change, depending on the nature of the class project.

Class Project (group grade)	30%
Final Paper	20%
Homework/journal	15%
Attendance/participation	15%
Final exam	20%
TOTAL	100%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C

6/27/88
Susan

SIS forms

syllabus

intro chain game - write sentences on board!

ARC introduction

~~project~~ writing: what I wish I could change about L.A.
brainstorm in groups - 20 mins to write

project ideas

interview info—
what is it?
what kind of questions?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Note:
SIS = Student Information Sheet

Appendix D

ESL 33B
Summer 1988
Susan

PROJECT IDEAS

1. *Conservation/Recycling.* Many people say that the United States, while being one of the world's wealthiest nations, is also one of the most wasteful. Ours is a 'throw-away' society, in which new things are valued over old, and convenience often seems more important than quality. In the past few years, however, we have begun to see some of the dangers of this attitude. We are overusing our natural resources, our air and water has become polluted, and we are running out of room to dispose of ever increasing amounts of garbage.

What are the attitudes of "average" Americans towards the increasing environmental problems? What are the potential consequences of ignoring these problems? What is being done in Los Angeles, or at UCLA to work towards solving them? What can we as individuals do?

2. *Old Age in America.* Senior citizens in America have lived through a century of vast and extraordinary changes in this country, and many have wonderful stories to tell about their lives. What was Los Angeles like 40 or 50 years ago? What changes have these people seen? What was life like for immigrants from different countries in the first half of the 20th century? What is life like for these people now?

3. *Budget Guide to L.A. Restaurants.* Where can you eat in Westwood for under $5.00 a person? Do you have to go all the way to Monterey Park to get reasonably-priced, good Chinese food? Where do UCLA students like to eat? What varieties of ethnic food are available nearby?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix E

ESL 33B/Summer 1988
Susan

RESOURCE INVENTORY - Tentative

Name _____ Phone Number _____

Address _____
Length of time in Los Angeles _____
Which skills do you possess?

___ Typing
___ Word Processing
___ Artistic Ability
___ Good at talking to strangers
___ Fast reader
___ Photography
___ Proof reading/editing
___ Organizing things logicallyu
___ Library research
___ Others: _____

Which of the following do you have/know how to use?

Have	Can Use	
___	_____	Camera
___	_____	Car
___	_____	Video Cassetee Recorder
___	_____	Personal Computer
___	_____	Slide Projector
___	_____	TaperRecorder

Are you willing to help out in the following areas?

___ Visiting/writing about/giving your opioion about places in L.A. such as restaurants, beaches, etc

___ Co-ordinating the different groups to help put the final Guide to L.A. together

___ Deciding on a group to present the final project to, and sending invitations

___

Do you have any special knowledge or expertise in any areas that your team is not working on (e.g. favorite restaurants, friends who are gang members, native speakers you know who might want to tell the class about student life at UCLA or some other area, etc.....)?

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix F

Name_____
Date_____

WEEKLY REVIEW

1. What new vocabulary have you learned this week?

_____

_____

2. Which of these new words can you use with confidence?

_____

_____

3. Which of these new words do you feel unsure about?

_____

_____

4. What can you say/do this week that you couldn't say/do last week?

_____

_____

5. What have you learned about the language that you didn't know before this week?

_____

_____

6. What have you read this week? _____
   What have you listened to this week? _____
   What have you written this week? _____
   How much English have you spoken this week? _____

7. What progress towards the class project have you made this week?

_____

_____

8. What will you need to learn in order to make progress towards the project next week?

_____

_____

9. Any comments?

_____

_____